

**RICHARDS
LAYTON &
FINGER**

Chad M. Shandler
302-651-7836
shandler@rlf.com

August 15, 2008

**BY ELECTRONIC MAIL
AND HAND DELIVERY**

The Honorable Vincent J. Poppiti
Blank Rome LLP
Chase Manhattan Centre, Suite 800
1201 Market Street
Wilmington, DE 19801-4226

Re: Honeywell, et al. v. Apple Computer, et al.
C.A. 04-1338-JJF (Consolidated)

Dear Judge Poppiti:

This letter constitutes Eastman Kodak Company's submission in response to Honeywell's request for commercial success discovery. Kodak's position was comprehensively outlined in the joint letter submitted to Magistrate Thyng by the customer defendants on March 12, 2007. (D.I. 732). Kodak would like to note additionally that Honeywell's August 5, 2008 letter regarding commercial success discovery is limited to the commercial success of Optrex and Samsung SDI modules. Neither the three Kodak products initially accused by Honeywell nor any of the products identified by Kodak in its October 28, 2005 and January 13, 2006 letters are manufactured by these entities. We are mindful that Honeywell has the opportunity to identify additional Kodak products that it believes contain accused Optrex or Samsung SDI modules. Nevertheless, it is unlikely that Kodak has any information relevant to commercial success at all, let alone information not possessed by the manufacturer defendants. The "improvement" claimed by Honeywell is a slight misalignment of the lens arrays of an LCD module. It is even less likely Kodak would have any information as to why Samsung or SDI chose that configuration over any other possible configuration.

Respectfully submitted,



Chad M. Shandler (#3796)

CMS/jab

cc: Clerk of the Court (via Electronic Filing)
All Counsel of Record (via e-mail)

■ ■ ■